

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 have been canceled herein. Claims 20-31, added herein, are pending with Claims 20, 24-26 and 28-31 being independent.

Claims 1-7 and 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nunokawa et al. (US 7,159,960). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The liquid ejecting apparatus of Nunokawa et al. includes a liquid ejecting section for ejecting liquid droplets of a plurality of sizes towards a medium and a controller for controlling ejection of liquid droplets from the ejecting section. The controller controls ejection of the liquid droplets from the liquid ejecting section such that the liquid droplets of the smallest size, among the liquid droplets of the plurality of sizes, are not included in the liquid droplets that are outside of and that do not land on the medium. Nunokawa et al. however, describes droplets of plural sizes being ejected to a central region of the medium.

Nunokawa et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least a method of allowing or causing ejection of a second ink droplet, which is of a size smaller than that of a first ink droplet, without ejection of the first ink droplet to a region including a central portion of a recording medium, as is recited in independent Claims 20, 24-26, 28, and 29. Nor does Nunokawa et al. disclose or suggest at least an apparatus that controls the ejection of the

ink droplets from the recording head so as to (1) specify a first region including a neighborhood of an end of a recording medium or outside the recording medium and allow the ejection of the first ink droplet without the ejection of the second ink droplet from the recording head to the first region, and (2) specify a second region including a central portion of the recording medium and allow the ejection of the second ink droplet without the ejection of the first ink droplet from the recording head to the second region, as is recited in independent Claims 30 and 31.

Accordingly, Nunokawa et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

Thus, independent Claims 20, 24-26 and 28-31 are patentable over the citation of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection are requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 20, 24-26 and 28-31. Dependent Claims 21-23 and 27 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200